

## REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 – 17, 27, 29 - 40 are currently active in this case. Claims 2, 5 – 15, 17 27, 29, 32, 34, and 35 have been amended, and Claims 1 and 18 -26, and 28 have been cancelled by way of the present amendment. Each new and amended Claim is supported by the specification and claims as originally submitted and no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 12-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pauna* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,052,524) in view of *Testa et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,205,407); and Claims 5, 11, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pauna* in view of *Testa* and in further view of *Hill et al.* (U.S. Pat No. 6,438,514).

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter in Claims 29-40. Claims 29, 32, 34 and 35 have been amended to be in independent form including all the limitations of each corresponding base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29, 32, 34 and 35 are patentable over the cited references.

Claim 17 recites:

***A system for creating a behavioral model of an electronic system having hardware and software components, comprising:***

***a plurality of architectural components, each of the architectural components corresponding to a component capable of being implemented as part of the electronic system; and***

***means for generating communication patterns between the architectural components that require communication between them in order to perform user specified behaviors, each communication pattern including communication between any intervening architectural components needed to communicate between architectural components carrying out the behaviors,***

***wherein the architectural components are high level architectural components and not component level design items.***

Applicants respectfully traverse any assertion that would indicate Claim 17 as being unpatentable.

Claim 27 recites:

***27.) A performance level model of the communications between behaviors of an electronic system having hardware and software components, the model comprising:  
an application programming interface for a first behavior that provides data to be transferred to one or more destination behaviors;***

***a first service that implements the application programming interface that models the performance of the communication protocol, the first service being among a plurality of services supported by the pattern to which the behavior communication is mapped;***

***one or more application programming interfaces used by the first service to model performance of the architecture platform, the application interfaces being among a plurality of service declarations supported by the***

***symbol of the architectural component to which the first behavior is mapped;***

***a supported service declaration on the symbol of the architecture component by a service definition, the service definition being among a plurality of service definitions specified by the performance model of the architecture component;***

***a second application interface that represents a function to be performed by a second architectural component topologically connected to the first component of the electronic system, the second service being one a plurality of second services each corresponding to a function capable of being performed by the second architectural component;***

***an input application interface on the destination behavior that receives output information of the performance level model of the electronic system, thereby completing a communication from source behavior to destination behavior,***

***wherein the model is configured to,***  
***capture a plurality of behaviors that correspond to operations performed by the system being modeled,***  
***capture a plurality of hardware and software architectural components the plurality being contained within an architectural platform,***

***map each of the captured behaviors of the plurality of behaviors to a selected architectural component to perform the behavior,***

**recognize and capture communication patterns among  
the architectural components that require communication  
among them in order to perform the behaviors, and  
map each instance of communication between  
behaviors to an instance of the captured pattern and re-map  
portions of the behavioral blocks to different architectural  
blocks and causing implementations of behavior to move  
between hardware and software.**

However, the cited references fail to teach or suggest similar subject matter.

Applicants respectfully note that Claim 17 and 27 include limitations similar, but not identical, to those already identified as being allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 17 and 27 are patentable over the cited references.

Claims 29, 32, 34, and 35 have been amended to be independent from and have already been identified as being patentable.

Based on the patentability of independent Claims 17, 27, 29, 32, 34, 35, Applicants further respectfully submit that dependent Claims 2-16, 30, 31, 33, 36-50, and 52 are also patentable.

Consequently, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and it is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Dated: 9/01/05

Respectfully submitted,

REED SMITH LLP

Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 7936  
San Francisco, CA 94120-7936  
**Direct Dial: (415) 659-5927**  
Facsimile: (415) 391-8269

By: 

Name: John W. Carpenter  
Reg. No. 39,129

DOCSSFO-12408239.1